arXiv:1511.08525v1 [math.NT] 26 Nov 2015

# ALGEBRAIC APPROXIMATIONS TO LINEAR COMBINATIONS OF POWERS: AN EXTENSION OF RESULTS BY MAHLER AND CORVAJA-ZANNIER

AVINASH KULKARNI, NIKI MYRTO MAVRAKI, AND KHOA D. NGUYEN

Abstract. For every complex number $x$, let $\|x\|_{\mathbb{Z}} := \min\{|x-m| : \ m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Let $K$ be a number field, let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ be non-zero algebraic numbers. In this paper, we completely solve the problem of the existence of $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that there are infinitely many tuples $(n, q_1, \ldots, q_k)$ satisfying $\|q_1\alpha_1^n + \ldots + q_k\alpha_k^n\|_{\mathbb{Z}} < \theta^n$ where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_k \in K^*$ having small logarithmic height compared to $n$. In the special case when $q_1, \ldots, q_k$ have the form $q_i = qc_i$ for fixed $c_1, \ldots, c_k$, our work yields results on algebraic approximations of $c_1\alpha_1^n + \ldots + c_k\alpha_k^n$ of the form $\dfrac{m}{q}$ with $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q \in K^*$ (where $q$ has small logarithmic height compared to $n$). Various results on linear recurrence sequences also follow as an immediate consequence. The case $k = 1$ and $q_1$ is essentially a rational integer was obtained by Corvaja and Zannier and settled a long-standing question of Mahler. The use of the Subspace Theorem based on work of Corvaja-Zannier together with several modifications play an important role in the proof of our results.

## 1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of positive integers and fix an embedding from $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ to $\mathbb{C}$. For every complex number $x$, let $\|x\|_{\mathbb{Z}}$ denote the distance to the nearest integer:

$$\|x\|_{\mathbb{Z}} := \min\{|x-m| : \ m \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

In 1957, Mahler [Mah57] used Roth's theorem (or more precisely, Ridout's non-archimedean version of Roth's theorem) to prove that for $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $\alpha > 1$ and for $\theta \in (0,1)$, there are only finitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\alpha^n\|_{\mathbb{Z}} < \theta^n$. Consequently, the number $g(k)$ in Waring's Problem satisfies:

$$g(k) = 2^k + \left\lfloor \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^k \right\rfloor - 2$$

except for possibly finitely many $k$. Mahler also asked for which algebraic numbers $\alpha$ the above conclusion remains valid. In 2004, by ingenious applications of the Subspace Theorem, Corvaja and Zannier obtained the following answer to Mahler's question [CZ04, Theorem 1]:

*Date*: 26 November, 2015.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 11J68, 11J87. Secondary: 11B37, 11R06.

*Key words and phrases.* algebraic approximations, linear combinations of powers, linear recurrence sequences, Subspace Theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** (Corvaja-Zannier). *Let $\alpha > 1$ be a real algebraic number. Assume that for some $\theta \in (0,1)$, there are infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\alpha^n\|_{\mathbb{Z}} < \theta^n$. Then there is $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha^d$ is a Pisot number.*

Note that a Pisot number is a real algebraic integer greater than 1 while all the other conjugates have modulus less than 1. By considering the trace of $\alpha^{dn}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it is clear that the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 is optimal. Moreover, the condition that $\alpha$ is algebraic is necessary as illustrated in an example constructed by Corvaja and Zannier [CZ04, Appendix].

By regarding $\{\alpha^n : \ n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ as a very special instance of linear recurrence sequences, it is natural to ask for an extension of Theorem 1.1 to an arbitrary linear recurrence sequence of the form $\{Q_1(n)\alpha_1^n + \ldots + Q_k(n)\alpha_k^n : \ n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ where $\alpha_i \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ and $Q_i(x) \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}[x] \setminus \{0\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. *Without loss of generality, we can assume that $|\alpha_i| \geq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$.* In fact, we will solve this problem for the more general sequence of the form $q_1\alpha_1^n + \ldots + q_k\alpha_k^n$ where $q_1, \ldots, q_k$ are non-zero algebraic numbers having small logarithmic height compared to $n$.

Let $G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the absolute Galois group of $\mathbb{Q}$ and let $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ be the group of roots of unity. We have:

**Definition 1.2.** *The tuple of non-zero algebraic numbers $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ is called non-degenerate if $\dfrac{\alpha_i}{\alpha_j} \notin \boldsymbol{\mu}$ for $1 \leq i \neq j \leq k$.*

This definition does not rule out the possibility that some $\alpha_i$ is a root of unity. When working with sums of the form $q_1\alpha_1^n + \ldots + q_k\alpha_k^n$, we can assume that $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ is non-degenerate without loss of generality. Indeed, suppose $\dfrac{\alpha_k}{\alpha_{k-1}} = \zeta$ is an $m$-th root of unity. For $0 \leq r \leq m-1$, we restrict to $n \in \mathbb{N}$ congruent to $r$ modulo $m$, and write $n = r + m\tilde{n}$. Then the sum $q_1\alpha_1^r(\alpha_1^m)^{\tilde{n}} + q_2\alpha_2^r(\alpha_2^m)^{\tilde{n}} + \ldots + (q_{k-1} + \zeta^r q_k)\alpha_{k-1}^r(\alpha_{k-1}^m)^{\tilde{n}}$ is equal to and has less terms than the original sum $q_1\alpha_1^n + \ldots + q_k\alpha_k^n$.

The following definition generalizes the notion of Pisot numbers:

**Definition 1.3.** *Let $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k)$ be a tuple of of distinct non-zero algebraic numbers. Write:*

$$B := \{\beta \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^* \setminus \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k\} : \ \beta = \sigma(\beta_i) \text{ for some } \sigma \in G_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

*Then the tuple $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k)$ is called pseudo-Pisot if $\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{k} \beta_i + \sum_{\beta \in B} \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $|\beta| < 1$ for every $\beta \in B$. Moreover, if $\beta_i$ is an algebraic integer for $1 \leq i \leq k$ then the tuple $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k)$ is called Pisot.*

Note that when $k = 1$, our definition of being pseudo-Pisot here is slightly different from Corvaja-Zannier [CZ04, p. 176] since we do not require that $|\beta_i| > 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Such generality is necessary in order to deal with the condition $|\alpha_i| \geq 1$ with the possibility of an equality.

Let $h$ denote the absolute logarithmic Weil height (see [BG06] or Section 2). By a *sublinear function*, we mean a function $f : \mathbb{N} \to (0, \infty)$ satisfying $\lim\limits_{n \to \infty} \dfrac{f(n)}{n} = 0$. Let $K$ be a number field, our main result is the following:

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ be a non-degenerate tuple of algebraic numbers satisfying $|\alpha_i| \geq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and let $f$ be a sublinear function. Assume that for some $\theta \in (0,1)$, the set $\mathcal{M}$ of $(n, q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in \mathbb{N} \times (K^*)^k$ satisfying:*

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{k} q_i \alpha_i^n \right\|_{\mathbb{Z}} < \theta^n \text{ and } \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} h(q_i) < f(n)$$

*is infinite. For all but finitely many $(n, q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in \mathcal{M}$, the following hold:*

(i) *The tuple $(q_1\alpha_1^n, \ldots, q_k\alpha_k^n)$ is pseudo-Pisot.*
(ii) *$\alpha_i$ is an algebraic integer for $1 \leq i \leq k$.*
(iii) *For $\sigma \in G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, $\sigma(q_i\alpha_i^n) = q_j\alpha_j^n$ if and only if $\dfrac{\sigma(\alpha_i)}{\alpha_j} \in \boldsymbol{\mu}$.*
(iv) *For $\sigma \in G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, if $\dfrac{\sigma(\alpha_i)}{\alpha_j} \notin \boldsymbol{\mu}$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$ then $|\sigma(\alpha_i)| < 1$.*

When $k = 1$, properties (i) and (ii) recover the conclusion in Theorem 1.1. As is the case with the Corvaja-Zannier theorem, it is not difficult to see that properties (i)-(iv) above are sufficient. In fact $q_1\alpha_1^n + \ldots + q_k\alpha_k^n$ is a subsum of an integer-valued trace and, according to properties (iii) and (iv), any term that does not appear in this subsum must have the form $\sigma(q_i\alpha_i^n)$ with $|\sigma(\alpha_i)| < 1$. Now since $h(\sigma(q_i)) < f(n) = o(n)$, we have that $|\sigma(q_i\alpha_i^n)| < \theta^n$ for some $\theta \in (0,1)$ when $n$ is sufficiently large. This explains why we have $\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{k} q_i \alpha_i^n \right\|_{\mathbb{Z}} < \theta^n$.

*Remark* 1.5. As mentioned before, the condition $|\alpha_i| \geq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ is non-essential. Indeed if, say, $|\alpha_i| < 1$ then $|q_i\alpha_i^n| < \theta^n$ for every $\theta \in (|\alpha_i|, 1)$ when $n$ is sufficiently large. This follows from the condition that $|q_i| = e^{o(n)}$. Then we can simply consider the smaller subsum without the term $q_i\alpha_i^n$. If $\alpha_i$ is a root of unity then (by choosing $j = i$), Property (iii) implies that for all but finitely many $(n, q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in \mathcal{M}$, $\sigma(q_i\alpha_i^n) = q_i\alpha_i^n$ for every $\sigma$ which means $q_i\alpha_i^n \in \mathbb{Q}$.

For every polynomial $Q(x) \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}[x]$ and $\sigma \in G_{\mathbb{Q}}$, let $\sigma(Q)$ be the polynomial obtained by applying $\sigma$ to the coefficients of $Q$. For every rational function $R(x) \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(x)$, write $R(x) = \dfrac{Q_1(x)}{Q_2(x)}$, then we define $\sigma(R) = \dfrac{\sigma(Q_1)}{\sigma(Q_2)}$. This is independent of the choices of $(Q_1, Q_2)$. We have the following immediate consequences:

**Corollary 1.6.** *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ be as in Theorem 1.4. Let $a_n := R_1(n)\alpha_1^n + \ldots + R_k(n)\alpha_k^n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ where $R_1(x), \ldots, R_k(x) \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}(x) \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that for some $\theta \in (0,1)$, the set $\mathcal{M}_\theta = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \|a_n\|_{\mathbb{Z}} < \theta^n\}$ is infinite. Then the following hold:*

(i) *$\alpha_i$ is an algebraic integer for $1 \leq i \leq k$.*
(ii) *For $\sigma \in G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, if $\dfrac{\sigma(\alpha_i)}{\alpha_j} \notin \boldsymbol{\mu}$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$ then $|\sigma(\alpha_i)| < 1$.*
(iii) *For $\sigma \in G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, if $\dfrac{\sigma(\alpha_i)}{\alpha_j} \in \boldsymbol{\mu}$ then the rational function $\dfrac{R_j}{\sigma(R_i)}$ is constant and $\dfrac{R_j}{\sigma(R_i)} = \left(\dfrac{\sigma(\alpha_i)}{\alpha_j}\right)^n$ for all but finitely many $n \in \mathcal{M}_\theta$.*

For an arbitrary linear recurrence sequence, we obtain the following result in the style of the classical Skolem-Mahler-Lech theorem.

**Corollary 1.7.** *Let $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an arbitrary linear recurrence sequence over $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. Assume that for some $\theta \in (0,1)$, the set $\mathcal{M}_\theta$ as defined in Corollary 1.6 is infinite. Then there is $\theta_0 \in (0,1)$ such that for every $\tilde{\theta} \in (\theta_0, 1)$, the set $\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{\theta}}$ is the union of a finite set and finitely many arithmetic progressions.*

The Subspace Theorem obtained by Schmidt and extended by Schlickewei and Evertse (see [Sch72], [ES02], [BG06, Chapter 7] and the references there) plays a crucial role in the proof of our results. Our applications of the Subspace Theorem are based on the paper [CZ04] together with several modifications. We conclude this introduction with a brief comparison to the compelling results of [CZ04]. The paper of Corvaja-Zannier settles the case $k = 1$ and $q_1$ is of the form $q\delta$ where $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\delta$ is a fixed algebraic number. In this paper, we investigate an arbitrary sum ($k \geq 1$) and allow the $q_i$'s to be in an arbitrary number field. While the key construction of linear forms in [CZ04, Lemma 3] is rather neat, the construction in this paper is a bit more complicated due to the extra generality noted above and so requires some technical modifications (see Section 3).

**Acknowledgments.** We wish to thank Professor Pietro Corvaja for useful comments. The third author is grateful to Professor Umberto Zannier for useful conversations at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in March 2014. The first author is partially supported by NSERC and the third author is partially supported by a UBC-PIMS fellowship.

## 2. Some classical applications of the Subspace Theorem

Let $M_{\mathbb{Q}} = M_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\infty} \cup M_{\mathbb{Q}}^{0}$ where $M_{\mathbb{Q}}^{0}$ is the set of $p$-adic valuations and $M_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\infty}$ is the singleton consisting of the usual archimedean valuation. More generally, for every number field $K$, write $M_K = M_K^{\infty} \cup M_K^{0}$ where $M_K^{\infty}$ is the set of archimedean places and $M_K^{0}$ is the set of finite places. For every $w \in M_K$, let $K_w$ denote the completion of $K$ with respect to $w$ and denote $d(w) = [K_w : \mathbb{Q}_v]$ where $v$ is the restriction of $w$ to $\mathbb{Q}$. Following [BG06, Chapter 1], for every $w \in M_K$ restricting to $v$ on $\mathbb{Q}$, we normalize $|\cdot|_w$ as follows:

$$|x|_w = |\,\mathrm{N}_{K_w/\mathbb{Q}_v}(x)|_v^{1/[K:\mathbb{Q}]}.$$

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, for every vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, \ldots, x_m) \in K^{m+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ denote the corresponding point in $\mathbb{P}^m(K)$. For every $w \in M_K$, denote $|\mathbf{x}|_w := \max\limits_{0\leq i\leq m} |x_i|_w$. For $P \in \mathbb{P}^m(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$, let $K$ be a number field such that $P = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ for some $\mathbf{x} \in K^{m+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and define:

$$H(P) = \prod_{w\in M_K} |\mathbf{x}|_w.$$

Define $h(P) = \log(H(P))$. For $\alpha \in K$, write $H(\alpha) := H([\alpha : 1])$ and write $h(\alpha) := \log(H(\alpha))$.

Now we present the celebrated Subspace Theorem. The readers are referred to [BG06, Chapter 7] and the references there for more details.

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $K$ be a number field, and let $S \subset M_K$ be finite. For every $v \in S$, let $L_{v0}, \ldots, L_{vn}$ be linearly independent linear forms in the variables $X_0, \ldots, X_n$ with $K$-algebraic coefficients in $K_v$. For every $\epsilon > 0$, the solutions*

$\mathbf{x} \in K^{n+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ *of the inequality:*

$$\prod_{v \in S} \prod_{j=0}^{n} \frac{|L_{vj}(\mathbf{x})|_v}{|\mathbf{x}|_v} \leq H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^{-n-1-\epsilon}$$

*are contained in finitely many hyperplanes of* $K^{n+1}$.

Variants of the following applications of the Subspace Theorem are well-known. We include the proofs due to the lack of an immediate reference.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let* $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ *be a non-degenerate tuple of non-zero algebraic numbers, let* $f$ *be a sublinear function, and let* $K$ *be a number field. Then there are only finitely many tuples* $(n, b_1, \ldots, b_k) \in \mathbb{N} \times (K^*)^k$ *satisfying:*

$$b_1\alpha_1^n + \ldots + b_k\alpha_k^n = 0 \text{ and } \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} h(b_i) < f(n).$$

*Proof.* Assume there is a counter-example given by $(K, f, k, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ where $k$ is minimal. This implies that there are infinitely many such tuples $(n, b_1, \ldots, b_k)$. By the height inequality on the $b_i$'s and the Northcott property, we must have that $n$ is unbounded in any infinite collection of such tuples. By extending $K$ if necessary, we can choose a finite subset $S$ of $M_K$ containing $M_K^\infty$ such that $\alpha_i$ is an $S$-unit for $1 \leq i \leq k$. We will prove that $k \geq 3$; obviously $k > 1$. If $k = 2$, we have $\dfrac{b_1}{b_2} = -\left(\dfrac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}\right)^n$. By non-degeneracy, $h(\alpha_2/\alpha_1) > 0$ while $h(b_1/b_2) < 2f(n) = o(n)$ which gives a contradiction when $n$ is sufficiently large.

Write $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}) := (b_1\alpha_1^n, \ldots, b_{k-1}\alpha_{k-1}^n)$. For $v \in S$, choose $i(v)$ with $1 \leq i(v) \leq k-1$ such that $|\mathbf{x}|_v = |x_{i(v)}|_v$. There are $(k-1)^{|S|}$ possibilities for the choices of the $i(v)$'s, hence we may assume that some *fixed* choice is used for infinitely many tuples $(n, b_1, \ldots, b_k)$, from now on we will focus on these tuples only. For $v \in S$ and $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, define:

$$L_{vj}(X_1, \ldots, X_{k-1}) = \begin{cases} X_j & \text{if } j \neq i(v) \\ X_1 + \ldots + X_{k-1} & \text{if } j = i(v) \end{cases}$$

Since the $\alpha_i$'s are $S$-units, by the product formula, we have:

$$\prod_{v \in S} \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{|L_{vj}(\mathbf{x})|_v}{|\mathbf{x}|_v} = \frac{\displaystyle\prod_{v \in S} \prod_{j=1}^{k} |b_j\alpha_j^n|_v}{\displaystyle\left(\prod_{v \in S} |\mathbf{x}|_v\right)^k} \leq \left(\prod_{v \in S} |\mathbf{x}|_v\right)^{-k} \prod_{j=1}^{k} H(b_j). \tag{1}$$

Again, using the fact that the $\alpha_i$'s are $S$-units, we have:

$$\prod_{v \in S} |\mathbf{x}|_v = \frac{H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})}{\displaystyle\prod_{v \notin S} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} |b_j|_v} \geq \frac{H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})}{\displaystyle\prod_{j=1}^{k-1} H(b_j)}. \tag{2}$$

From (1) and (2), we have:

$$\prod_{v \in S} \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{|L_{vj}(\mathbf{x})|_v}{|\mathbf{x}|_v} \leq H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^{-k} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{k} H(b_j)\right)^{k+1}. \tag{3}$$

Write $C = H([\alpha_1 : \ldots : \alpha_{k-1}])$ then $C > 1$ thanks to non-degeneracy of $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{k-1})$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H([\alpha_1^n : \ldots : \alpha_{k-1}^n])}{H([b_1^{-1} : \ldots : b_{k-1}^{-1}])} &\leq H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = H([b_1\alpha_1^n : \ldots : b_{k-1}\alpha_{k-1}^n]) \\ &\leq H([\alpha_1^n : \ldots : \alpha_{k-1}^n])H([b_1 : \ldots : b_{k-1}]) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

which implies

$$C^n \left( \prod_{j=1}^{k} H(b_j) \right)^{-1} \leq H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq C^n \prod_{j=1}^{k} H(b_j). \tag{5}$$

Since $\prod_{j=1}^{k} H(b_j) \leq e^{kf(n)} = e^{o(n)}$, inequalities (3) and (5) give that for every $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ we have:

$$\prod_{v \in S} \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{|L_{vj}(\mathbf{x})|_v}{|\mathbf{x}|_v} \leq H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^{-k+\epsilon} \leq H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^{-k+1-\epsilon}$$

when $n$ is sufficiently large. Hence Theorem 2.1 gives that there exist a subset $\{i_1, \ldots, i_\ell\}$ of $\{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ and $c_{i_1}, \ldots, c_{i_\ell} \in K^*$ such that:

$$c_{i_1} b_{i_1} \alpha_{i_1}^n + \ldots + c_{i_\ell} b_{i_\ell} \alpha_{i_\ell}^n = 0$$

for infinitely many tuples $(n, b_{i_1}, \ldots, b_{i_\ell})$. By modifying the sublinear function $f$, the infinitely many tuples $(n, c_{i_1} b_{i_1}, \ldots, c_{i_\ell} b_{i_\ell})$ yield that there is a counter-example with parameter $\ell \leq k-1 < k$, contradicting the minimality of $k$. □

The next result is a slight modification of [CZ04, Lemma 1]:

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $K$ be a number field, let $S$ be a finite subset of $M_K$ containing $M_K^\infty$, and let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$ be non-zero elements of $K$. Fix $w \in S$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\mathscr{S}$ be an infinite set of solutions $(u_1, \ldots, u_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k)$ of the inequality:*

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j b_j u_j \right|_w \leq \max\{|b_1 u_1|_w, \ldots, |b_k u_k|_w\} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{k} H(b_j) \right)^{-k-1-\epsilon} H([u_1 : \ldots : u_k : 1])^{-\epsilon}$$

*where $u_j$ is an $S$-unit and $b_j \in K^*$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$. Then there exists a non-trivial linear relation of the form $c_1 b_1 u_1 + \ldots + c_k b_k u_k = 0$ where $c_i \in K$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ satisfied by infinitely many elements of $\mathscr{S}$.*

*Proof.* When $k = 1$, the given inequality together with the Northcott property imply that the set $\mathscr{S}$ must be finite. Hence we may assume $k \geq 2$. We now apply the Subspace Theorem as in the proof of [CZ04, Lemma 1]. Without loss of generality and by replacing $\mathscr{S}$ by an infinite subset, we may assume:

$$|b_1 u_1|_w = \max\{|b_1 u_1|_w, \ldots, |b_k u_k|_w\}$$

for every $(u_1, \ldots, u_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k) \in \mathscr{S}$. For $v \in S$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$, if $(v, j) \neq (w, 1)$ define $L_{vj}(X_1, \ldots, X_k) = X_j$; define $L_{w1}(X_1, \ldots, X_k) = \lambda_1 X_1 + \ldots + \lambda_k X_k$. Write

$\mathbf{x} = (b_1u_1, \ldots, b_ku_k)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{v\in S}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{|L_{vj}(\mathbf{x})|_v}{|\mathbf{x}|_v} &= \frac{\prod_{v\in S}\prod_{j=1}^{k}|b_ju_j|_v}{|b_1u_1|_w}|\sum_{j=1}^{k}\lambda_jb_ju_j|_w\left(\prod_{v\in S}|\mathbf{x}|_v\right)^{-k} \\ &\leq \frac{(\prod_{j=1}^{k}H(b_j))(\prod_{j=1}^{k}H(b_j))^{-k-1-\epsilon}H([u_1:\ldots:u_k:1])^{-\epsilon}}{\left(\prod_{v\in S}|\mathbf{x}|_v\right)^{k}}\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 2.2, we have: $\prod_{v\in S}|\mathbf{x}|_v \geq \frac{H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})}{\prod_{j=1}^{k}H(b_j)}$. Together with (6), we have:

$$\prod_{v\in S}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{|L_{vj}(\mathbf{x})|_v}{|\mathbf{x}|_v} \leq H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^{-k}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k}H(b_j)\right)^{-\epsilon}H([u_1:\ldots:u_k:1])^{-\epsilon}. \tag{7}$$

Using $H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq H([u_1:\ldots:u_k])\prod_{j=1}^{k}H(b_j) \leq H([u_1:\ldots:u_k:1])\prod_{j=1}^{k}H(b_j)$, we obtain:

$$\prod_{v\in S}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{|L_{vj}(\mathbf{x})|_v}{|\mathbf{x}|_v} \leq H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^{-k-\epsilon}.$$

Theorem 2.1 yields the desired conclusion. □

## 3. The Key Technical Results Toward the Proof of Theorem 1.4

The main technical results obtained in this section play a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 1.4. We define an equivalence relation $\approx$ on $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ as follows: $\alpha \approx \beta$ if there is $\sigma \in G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $\frac{\alpha}{\sigma(\beta)} \in \boldsymbol{\mu}$. Let $K$ be a number field and write $d = [K:\mathbb{Q}]$. We have the following:

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let $\{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_d\}$ be a basis of $K$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. There exist constants $C_1$ and $C_2$ depending only on the $\gamma_i$'s such that for every $q \in K$ we can write $q = \sum_{i=1}^{d} b_i\gamma_i$ where $b_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying $h(b_i) \leq C_1h(q) + C_2$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$.*

*Proof.* We can solve for the coefficients $b_i$'s using the discriminant of the given basis and the Galois conjugates of $q$ and the $\gamma_i$'s to obtain the desired height inequality. □

3.1. **A common setup.** The notation and assumptions given in this subsection will appear many times. Let $K$, $k$, $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$, and $f$ be as in Theorem 1.4; in particular $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ is non-degenerate. Assume there is $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that the set $\mathcal{M}$ defined as in Theorem 1.4 is infinite. Let $\mathcal{M}_0$ be an infinite subset of $\mathcal{M}$. By the given inequality on $\max_{1\leq i\leq k} h(q_i)$ and the Northcott property, we observe that there are only finitely many elements of $\mathcal{M}$ where $n$ is bounded.

The tuple $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ is said to satisfy Property (P1) if the following holds:

(P1) For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, $[\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_i) : \mathbb{Q}] = [\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_i^m) : \mathbb{Q}]$. In other words, if $\beta \neq \alpha_i$ is Galois conjugate to $\alpha_i$ then $\dfrac{\beta}{\alpha_i} \notin \boldsymbol{\mu}$.

The tuple $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ is said to satisfy Property (P2) if the following holds:

(P2) For $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ if $\alpha_i \approx \alpha_j$ then $\alpha_i$ is Galois conjugate to $\alpha_j$.

Later on, we will use the fact that these properties hold when we replace $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ by $(\alpha_1^m, \ldots, \alpha_k^m)$ for some sufficiently large integer $m$. We have:

**Lemma 3.2.** *If $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ satisfies both Properties (P1) and (P2) then the following holds. For $1 \leq i, j \leq k$, if $\beta$ is Galois conjugate to $\alpha_i$, $\gamma$ is Galois conjugate to $\alpha_j$, and $\dfrac{\beta}{\gamma} \in \boldsymbol{\mu}$ then $\beta = \gamma$.*

*Proof.* We must have $\alpha_i \approx \alpha_j$, hence Property (P2) implies that $\alpha_i$ is Galois conjugate to $\alpha_j$. Hence we can write $\beta = \sigma(\alpha_i)$ and $\gamma = \tau(\alpha_i)$ for some $\sigma, \tau \in G_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Since $\dfrac{\beta}{\gamma} \in \boldsymbol{\mu}$, we have $\dfrac{\tau^{-1}\sigma(\alpha_i)}{\alpha_i} \in \boldsymbol{\mu}$. Property (P1) gives $\tau^{-1}\sigma(\alpha_i) = \alpha_i$. Hence $\beta = \sigma(\alpha_i) = \tau(\alpha_i) = \gamma$. □

For the rest of this subsection, assume that $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ satisfies both Properties (P1) and (P2). By extending $K$, we may choose a finite subset $S$ of $M_K$ containing $M_K^\infty$ such that $\alpha_i$ is an $S$-unit for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Now we partition $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k\}$ into $\mathfrak{s}$ subsets whose cardinalities are denoted by $m_1, \ldots, m_{\mathfrak{s}}$ according to the $\mathfrak{s}$ equivalence classes with respect to $\approx$. *From now on, we relabel our notation as $\alpha_{i,1}, \ldots, \alpha_{i,m_i}$ where $\{\alpha_{i,1}, \ldots, \alpha_{i,m_i}\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ are the sets in the resulting partition. The $q_1, \ldots, q_k$ are also relabelled as $q_{i,1}, \ldots, q_{i,m_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ accordingly.* So the original sum $\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{k} q_i \alpha_i^n$ is now denoted as $\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} q_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}^n$. We will also denote the tuple $(n, q_1, \ldots, q_k)$ by $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j}$. Write $d = [K : \mathbb{Q}]$ and let $\{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_d\}$ be a basis of $K$ over $\mathbb{Q}$.

By Property (P2), for $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$, the elements $\alpha_{i,1}, \ldots, \alpha_{i,m_i}$ are Galois conjugate to each other and we let $d_i \geq m_i$ denote the number of all possible Galois conjugates. We now denote all the other Galois conjugates that do not appear in $\{\alpha_{i,1}, \ldots, \alpha_{i,m_i}\}$ as $\alpha_{i,m_i+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{i,d_i}$. Let $L/\mathbb{Q}$ be the Galois closure of $K/\mathbb{Q}$. For every $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q})$, for $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$, let $\sigma_i$ be the permutation on $\{1, \ldots, d_i\}$ corresponding to the action of $\sigma$ on $\{\alpha_{i,1}, \ldots, \alpha_{i,d_i}\}$. In other words, $\sigma(\alpha_{i,j}) = \alpha_{i,\sigma_i(j)}$ for $1 \leq j \leq d_i$.

3.2. **The Key Technical Results.** Let $K$, $k$, $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$, $f$, $\theta$, $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M}_0$, $S$, $L$, $d$, and the basis $\{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_d\}$ be as in Subsection 3.1; in particular $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ satisfies both (P1) and (P2) and each $\alpha_i$ is an $S$-unit. Relabel the $\alpha_i$'s and $q_i$'s as $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $q_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, and let $d_1, \ldots, d_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\alpha_{i,j}$ for $m_i < j \leq d_i$ as before.

*Remark* 3.3. Let $x$ be a complex number. When the fractional part of the real part of $x$ is $\dfrac{1}{2}$, there are two integers having the closest distance to $x$. To be precise, we define the closest integer to $x$ to be the *smallest* integer $p$ such that $|x - p| = \|x\|_{\mathbb{Z}}$.

**Proposition 3.4.** *There exists an infinite subset $\mathcal{M}_1$ of $\mathcal{M}_0$ such that the following holds. For every $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} = (n, q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in \mathcal{M}_1$, let $p$ denote the closest integer*

*to* $\sum_{i=1}^{k} q_i\alpha_i^n = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} q_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n$. *We can write* $p = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{d_i}\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n$ *with the following properties:*

(i) $\eta_{i,j} \in L$ *and* $h(\eta_{i,j}) = o(n)$ *for* $1 \le i \le \mathfrak{s}$ *and* $1 \le j \le d_i$.
(ii) *For every* $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q})$ *and* $1 \le i \le \mathfrak{s}$, *let* $\sigma_i$ *denote the induced permutation on* $\{1,\dots,d_i\}$ *as in Subsection 3.1. We have* $\sigma(\eta_{i,j}) = \eta_{i,\sigma_i(j)}$ *for* $1 \le i \le \mathfrak{s}$ *and* $1 \le j \le d_i$.
(iii) $q_{i,j} = \eta_{i,j}$ *for* $1 \le i \le \mathfrak{s}$ *and* $1 \le j \le m_i$.
(iv) *Let* $B$ *be the set of* $\beta$ *such that* $\beta \notin \{q_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n : 1 \le i \le \mathfrak{s},\ 1 \le j \le m_i\}$ *and* $\beta$ *is Galois conjugate to* $q_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n$ *for some* $1 \le i \le \mathfrak{s}$ *and* $1 \le j \le m_i$. *Then the elements* $\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n$ *for* $1 \le i \le \mathfrak{s}$ *and* $m_i < j \le d_i$ *are distinct and are exactly all the elements of* $B$.

*Proof.* For every $v \in M_L^\infty$, fix $\sigma_v \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q})$ such that $v$ corresponds to the (real or complex) embedding $\sigma_v^{-1}$. In other words, for every $\alpha \in L$, we have:

$$|\alpha|_v = |\sigma_v^{-1}(\alpha)|^{d(v)/[L:\mathbb{Q}]}.$$

For $1 \le i \le \mathfrak{s}$ and for $v \in M_L^\infty$, let $\sigma_{v,i}$ be the induced permutation on $\{1,\dots,d_i\}$ as in Subsection 3.1 which means $\sigma_v(\alpha_{i,j}) = \alpha_{i,\sigma_{v,i}(j)}$.

For $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_0$, for $1 \le i \le \mathfrak{s}$ and $1 \le j \le m_i$, write:

$$q_{i,j} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} b_{i,j,\ell}\gamma_\ell$$

where $b_{i,j,\ell} \in \mathbb{Q}$. Let $p$ be the closest integer to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i} q_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\sum_{\ell=1}^{d}\gamma_\ell b_{i,j,\ell}\alpha_{i,j}^n.$$

Since $\sum_{v\in M_L^\infty} d(v) = [L:\mathbb{Q}]$ and by the definition of $\mathcal{M}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta^n &> \left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\sum_{\ell=1}^{d}\gamma_\ell b_{i,j,\ell}\alpha_{i,j}^n - p\right| = \prod_{v\in M_L^\infty}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\sum_{\ell=1}^{d}\gamma_\ell b_{i,j,\ell}\alpha_{i,j}^n - p\right|^{\frac{d(v)}{[L:\mathbb{Q}]}} \\ &= \prod_{v\in M_L^\infty}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}\sum_{\ell=1}^{d}\sigma_v(\gamma_\ell) b_{i,j,\ell}\alpha_{i,\sigma_{v,i}(j)}^n - p\right|_v.\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Let $\mathscr{I}$ be the set of quadruples $(i, j_1, j_2, \ell)$ satisfying the following: $1 \le i \le \mathfrak{s}$, $1 \le j_1 \le m_i$, $1 \le j_2 \le d_i$, and $1 \le \ell \le d$. For each $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_0$, we associate a vector $\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{y}(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j}$ whose components are indexed by $\mathscr{I}$ and defined to be $y_{(i,j_1,j_2,\ell)} = b_{i,j_1,\ell}\alpha_{i,j_2}^n$ for $(i, j_1, j_2, \ell) \in \mathscr{I}$. For $v \in M_L^\infty$ and $\mathbf{a} = (i, j_1, j_2, \ell) \in \mathscr{I}$, define

$$\delta_{v,\mathbf{a}} = \begin{cases} \sigma_v(\gamma_\ell) & \text{if } \sigma_{v,i}(j_1) = j_2 \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma_{v,i}(j_1) \ne j_2 \end{cases}.$$

Inequality (8) can be rewritten as:

$$\prod_{v\in M_L^\infty}\left|\sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\mathscr{I}}\delta_{v,\mathbf{a}} y_{\mathbf{a}} - p\right|_v < \theta^n. \tag{9}$$

Among all infinite subsets of $\mathcal{M}_0$, let $\mathcal{M}_0'$ be such that the vector space over $L$ generated by the set $\{\mathbf{y}(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} : (n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_0'\}$ has minimal dimension. Let $V$ denote this vector space and let $\mathfrak{r} = \dim_L(V)$. By applying Gaussian elimination to a system of linear equations defining $V$, we obtain a subset $\mathscr{I}^*$ of $\mathscr{I}$ consisting of $\mathfrak{r}$ elements together with scalars $c_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} \in L$ for $\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{I} \setminus \mathscr{I}^*$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathscr{I}^*$ such that $V$ is given by the linear system:

$$Y_{\mathbf{a}} = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathscr{I}^*} c_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} Y_{\mathbf{b}} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{I} \setminus \mathscr{I}^*.$$

Therefore $y_{\mathbf{a}} = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathscr{I}^*} c_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} y_{\mathbf{b}}$ for $\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{I} \setminus \mathscr{I}^*$. Consequently, for every $v \in M_L^\infty$, we can write $\sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathscr{I}} \delta_{v,\mathbf{a}} y_{\mathbf{a}} = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathscr{I}^*} \tilde{c}_{v,\mathbf{b}} y_{\mathbf{b}}$ where the $\tilde{c}_{v,\mathbf{b}}$'s for $\mathbf{b} \in \mathscr{I}^*$ depend only on $\mathscr{I}$, $\mathscr{I}^*$, $v$, the $\delta_{v,\mathbf{a}}$'s, and the $c_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$'s. Inequality (9) is rewritten as:

$$\prod_{v \in M_L^\infty} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathscr{I}^*} \tilde{c}_{v,\mathbf{b}} y_{\mathbf{b}} - p \right|_v < \theta^n. \tag{10}$$

We are ready to apply the Subspace Theorem as follows. The vector of variables $\mathbf{X}$ consists of $X_0$ and $X_{\mathbf{b}}$ for $\mathbf{b} \in \mathscr{I}^*$. Let $S'$ be the set of places of $L$ lying above $S$. For $w \in S'$ the collection $\mathcal{L}_w$ of $|\mathscr{I}^*| + 1 = \mathfrak{r} + 1$ linear forms, whose members are denoted $L_{w,0}(\mathbf{X})$ and $L_{w,\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X})$ for $\mathbf{b} \in \mathscr{I}^*$, is defined as follows:

- If $w \in M_L^0$, define $L_{w,0}(\mathbf{X}) = X_0$ and $L_{w,\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}) = X_{\mathbf{b}}$.
- If $w \in M_L^\infty$, define $L_{w,\mathbf{b}}(\mathbf{X}) = X_{\mathbf{b}}$ and define:

$$L_{w,0}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathscr{I}^*} \tilde{c}_{w,\mathbf{b}} X_{\mathbf{b}} - X_0.$$

Clearly, the linear forms in $\mathcal{L}_w$ are linearly independent for every $w \in S'$.

For $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_0'$, we define the vector $\mathbf{x}$ whose coordinates are denoted as $x_0$ and $x_{\mathbf{b}}$ for $\mathbf{b} \in \mathscr{I}^*$ as follows:

$$x_0 = p \text{ and } x_{\mathbf{b}} = y_{\mathbf{b}}.$$

For $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, since $H(q_{i,j}) < e^{f(n)} = e^{o(n)}$, we have $|q_{i,j}| = e^{o(n)}$ and $H(b_{i,j,\ell}) = e^{o(n)}$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq d$ by Lemma 3.1. By (8), we have:

$$|p| \leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} q_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}^n \right| + 1 \leq C_3^n$$

for some constant $C_3$ depending only on $K$, the $\alpha_{i,j}$'s, and the sublinear function $f$. Hence there is a constant $C_4$ depending only on $K$, $S$, $f$, the $\alpha_{i,j}$'s, and the $\gamma_\ell$'s such that:

$$H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) < C_4^n. \tag{11}$$

Let $\mathscr{B} = \max\{H(b_{i,j,\ell}) : 1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}, 1 \leq j \leq d_i, 1 \leq \ell \leq d\} = e^{o(n)}$ and $N = d(d_1 + \ldots + d_{\mathfrak{s}})$ which is the number of triples $(i, j, \ell)$. By inequality (10), the

product formula (applied to the $S$-units $\alpha_{i,j}$'s), and the integrality of $p$, we have:

$$\prod_{w\in S'}\prod_{L\in\mathcal{L}_w}\frac{|L(\mathbf{x})|_w}{|\mathbf{x}|_w}\le\frac{\theta^n\mathscr{B}^{|\mathscr{I}^*|}}{\left(\prod_{w\in S'}|\mathbf{x}|_w\right)^{|\mathscr{I}^*|+1}}=\theta^n\mathscr{B}^{\mathfrak{r}}\left(\prod_{w\in S'}|\mathbf{x}|_w\right)^{-\mathfrak{r}-1}. \tag{12}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 2.2, we have:

$$\prod_{w\in S'}|\mathbf{x}|_w=\frac{H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})}{\prod_{w\notin S'}|\mathbf{x}|_w}\ge\frac{H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})}{\mathscr{B}^N}.$$

Together with (12), we have:

$$\prod_{w\in S'}\prod_{L\in\mathcal{L}_w}\frac{|L(\mathbf{x})|_w}{|\mathbf{x}|_w}\le\theta^n\mathscr{B}^{\mathfrak{r}+N(\mathfrak{r}+1)}H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^{-\mathfrak{r}-1}. \tag{13}$$

From $\theta\in(0,1)$, $\mathscr{B}=e^{o(n)}$, together with (11) and (13), there is $\epsilon>0$ such that:

$$\prod_{w\in S'}\prod_{L\in\mathcal{L}_w}\frac{|L(\mathbf{x})|_w}{|\mathbf{x}|_w}<H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^{-\mathfrak{r}-1-\epsilon}$$

when $n$ is sufficiently large. By Theorem 2.1, there exists a non-trivial linear relation:

$$a_0X_0+\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathscr{I}^*}a_{\mathbf{b}}X_{\mathbf{b}}=0$$

satisfied by infinitely many $(n,q_{i,j})_{i,j}\in\mathcal{M}_0'$ where $a_0,a_{\mathbf{b}}\in L$. In other words, there is an infinite subset $\mathcal{M}_2$ of $\mathcal{M}_0'$ such that:

$$a_0p+\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathscr{I}^*}a_{\mathbf{b}}y_{\mathbf{b}}=0 \tag{14}$$

holds for every $(n,q_{i,j})_{i,j}\in\mathcal{M}_2$. We claim that $a_0\neq0$.

Indeed, if we have $a_0=0$, the nontrivial linear relation $\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathscr{I}^*}a_{\mathbf{b}}y_{\mathbf{b}}=0$ implies that the vector space over $L$ generated by $\{\mathbf{y}(n,q_{i,j})_{i,j}:\ (n,q_{i,j})_{i,j}\in\mathcal{M}_2\}$ has dimension at most $\mathfrak{r}-1$. This violates the minimality of $\mathfrak{r}$.

Therefore, we can write $p=\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathscr{I}^*}\frac{-a_{\mathbf{b}}}{a_0}y_{\mathbf{b}}$. By the definition of $y_{\mathbf{b}}$ and the fact that $h(b_{i,j,\ell})=o(n)$ for every $(i,j,\ell)$, we can write:

$$p=\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{d_i}\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n \tag{15}$$

with $\eta_{i,j}\in L$ satisfying $h(\eta_{i,j})=o(n)$ for every $(i,j)$. Thus we can achieve property (i) in the proposition.

For $1\le i\le\mathfrak{s}$ and $m_i<j\le d_i$, we define $q_{i,j}=0$ formally. Then for every $(n,q_{i,j})_{i,j}\in\mathcal{M}_2$, we have:

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{d_i}(q_{i,j}-\eta_{i,j})\alpha_{i,j}^n\right|=\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}q_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n-p\right|<\theta^n \tag{16}$$

and

$$p = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{j=1}^{d_i} \sigma(\eta_{i,j}) \alpha_{i,\sigma_i(j)}^n = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{j=1}^{d_i} \sigma(\eta_{i,\sigma_i^{-1}(j)}) \alpha_{i,j}^n \quad \text{for } \sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q}). \tag{17}$$

Here we note that $\sigma_i^{-1}$ is the inverse of the permutation $\sigma_i$ on $\{1, \dots, d_i\}$ which is also the permutation induced from $\sigma^{-1}$. From (15) and (17), we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{j=1}^{d_i} (\eta_{i,j} - \sigma(\eta_{i,\sigma_i^{-1}(j)})) \alpha_{i,j}^n = 0 \quad \text{for } \sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q}). \tag{18}$$

For $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q})$, $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$, $1 \leq j \leq d_i$, let $\mathcal{M}_2(\sigma, i, j)$ denote the set of $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_2$ such that $\eta_{i,j} - \sigma(\eta_{i,\sigma_i^{-1}(j)}) \neq 0$. By Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 2.2, the set $\mathcal{M}_2(\sigma, i, j)$ is finite. Hence there is a subset $\mathcal{M}_2'$ of $\mathcal{M}_2$ such that $\mathcal{M}_2 \setminus \mathcal{M}_2'$ is finite and $\eta_{i,j} = \sigma(\eta_{i,\sigma_i^{-1}(j)})$ for every $i$, $j$, and $\sigma$ for every $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_2'$. This gives property (ii).

For $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$, $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, let $\mathcal{M}_2'(i, j)$ be the set of $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_2'$ such that $q_{i,j} - \eta_{i,j} \neq 0$. We claim that $\mathcal{M}_2'(i, j)$ is finite. Assume otherwise that some $\mathcal{M}_2'(i^*, j^*)$ is infinite. Then there is a *fixed* set $\mathscr{P}$ such that:

$$\mathscr{P} = \{(i, j) : \ 1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}, 1 \leq j \leq d_i, q_{i,j} - \eta_{i,j} \neq 0\}$$

for *infinitely many* $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_2'(i^*, j^*)$. In particular $(i^*, j^*) \in \mathscr{P}$. Inequality (16) gives:

$$\left| \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathscr{P}} (q_{i,j} - \eta_{i,j}) \alpha_{i,j}^n \right| < \theta^n \tag{19}$$

for infinitely many $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_2'(i^*, j^*)$. We have $|(q_{i^*,j^*} - \eta_{i^*,j^*}) \alpha_{i,j}^n| \geq |q_{i^*,j^*} - \eta_{i^*,j^*}|$ since $|\alpha_{i^*,j^*}| \geq 1$. For $(i, j) \in \mathscr{P}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, from $H(1/(q_{i,j} - \eta_{i,j})) = H(q_{i,j} - \eta_{i,j}) = e^{o(n)}$ , we have that $|q_{i,j} - \eta_{i,j}| > \delta^n$ when $n$ is sufficiently large. From (19), we can apply Proposition 2.3 to have a non-trivial linear relation among the $(q_{i,j} - \eta_{i,j}) \alpha_{i,j}^n$ for $(i, j) \in \mathscr{P}$ for infinitely many $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_2'(i^*, j^*)$. Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 3.2 now yield a contradiction. Hence $\mathcal{M}_2'(i, j)$ is finite for every $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$. Therefore there is a subset $\mathcal{M}_2''$ of $\mathcal{M}_2'$ such that $\mathcal{M}_2' \setminus \mathcal{M}_2''$ is finite and $q_{i,j} = \eta_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$ for every $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_2''$. This gives property (iii).

From the choice of $\mathcal{M}_2'$ and $\mathcal{M}_2''$, we have that $\eta_{i,j} \neq 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $1 \leq j \leq d_i$. Now if $\eta_{i_1,j_1} \alpha_{i_1,j_1}^n = \eta_{i_2,j_2} \alpha_{i_2,j_2}^n$ for some $(i_1, j_1) \neq (i_2, j_2)$ then $H(\alpha_{i_1,j_1}/\alpha_{i_2,j_2})^n = H(\eta_{i_1,j_1}/\eta_{i_2,j_2}) = e^{o(n)}$ which gives a contradiction as $n$ is sufficiently large thanks to Lemma 3.2. Hence there is a subset $\mathcal{M}_1$ of $\mathcal{M}_2''$ such that $\mathcal{M}_2'' \setminus \mathcal{M}_1$ is finite and the $\eta_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}^n$'s are distinct for every $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

Given $(n, q_{i,j}) \in \mathcal{M}_1$, let $B$ be the set defined in Property (iv) of the proposition. For $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $m_i < j \leq d_i$, there is $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q})$ such that $\sigma(\alpha_{i,1}) = \alpha_{i,j}$; consequently $\sigma_i(1) = j$. We have:

$$\sigma(q_{i,1} \alpha_{i,1}^n) = \sigma(\eta_{i,1}) \alpha_{i,j}^n = \eta_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}^n.$$

Hence $\eta_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}^n \in B$.

Conversely if $\beta \in B$, write $\beta = \sigma(q_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j}^n)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$, $1 \leq j \leq m_i$ and $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q})$. Then $\beta = \eta_{i,\sigma_i(j)} \alpha_{i,\sigma_i(j)}^n$. By the definition of $B$, we must have $m_i < \sigma_i(j) \leq d_i$.

Therefore the set $\mathcal{M}_1$ satisfies all the required properties (i)-(iv). This finishes the proof of the proposition. □

## 4. Proof of Theorem 1.4

Let $K$, $(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_k)$, $f$, $\theta$, and $\mathcal{M}$ be as in Theorem 1.4. By extending $K$, we may assume that there is a finite subset $S$ of $M_K$ containing $M_K^\infty$ such that $\alpha_i$ is an $S$-unit for $1\le i\le k$. For every $m\in\mathbb{N}$, for $0\le r\le m-1$, replacing $(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_k)$ by $(\alpha_1^m,\dots,\alpha_k^m)$ and replacing $\{(n,q_1,\dots,q_k)\in\mathcal{M}:\ n\equiv r \bmod m\}$ by $\left\{\left(\frac{n-r}{m},q_1\alpha_1^r,\dots,q_k\alpha_k^r\right):\ (n,q_1,\dots,q_r)\in\mathcal{M}:\ n\equiv r \bmod m\right\}$ if necessary, we may assume that $(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_k)$ satisfies Properties (P1) and (P2) defined in Subsection 3.1. Let the notation $\mathfrak{s}$, $m_1,\dots,m_{\mathfrak{s}}$, $\alpha_{i,j}$, and $q_{i,j}$ for $1\le i\le\mathfrak{s}$ and $1\le j\le m_i$ be as in Subsection 3.1. Then let $d_1,\dots,d_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\alpha_{i,j}$ for $1\le i\le\mathfrak{s}$ and $m_i<j\le d_i$ be as in Subsection 3.1. Let $L$ be the Galois closure of $K$ and let $S'$ be the set of places of $L$ lying above $S$.

4.1. **Proof of Property (i) of Theorem 1.4.** Assume there is an infinite subset $\mathcal{M}_0$ of $\mathcal{M}$ such that $(q_1\alpha_1^n,\dots,q_k\alpha_k^n)$ is not pseudo-Pisot for every $(n,q_1,\dots,q_k)\in\mathcal{M}_0$. Let $\mathcal{M}_1$ be an infinite subset of $\mathcal{M}_0$ satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 3.4. Hence for every $(n,q_{i,j})_{i,j}\in\mathcal{M}_1$, let $p$ denote the closest integer to $\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}q_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n$ then we can write $p=\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{d_i}\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n$ where the $\eta_{i,j}$'s satisfy the properties given in Proposition 3.4. Hence:

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=m_i+1}^{d_i}\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n\right|=\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{m_i}q_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n-p\right|<\theta^n. \tag{20}$$

By Lemma 3.2, Proposition 2.3, Proposition 2.2, and the fact that $H(\eta_{i,j})=e^{o(n)}$, we have:

$$\max\{|\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n|:\ 1\le i\le\mathfrak{s},m_i+1\le j\le d_i\}<1.$$

for all but finitely many $(n,q_{i,j})_{i,j}\in\mathcal{M}_1$. By Property (iv) in Proposition 3.4, we have that $(q_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n:\ 1\le i\le\mathfrak{s},1\le j\le m_i)$ is a pseudo-Pisot tuple for all but finitely many $(n,q_{i,j})_{i,j}\in\mathcal{M}_1$. This contradicts the choice of $\mathcal{M}_0$.

4.2. **Proof of Property (ii) of Theorem 1.4.** Without loss of generality, assume that $\alpha_{1,1}$ is not an algebraic integer and we will arrive at a contradiction. There is a non-archimedean place $w\in S'$ such that $|\alpha_{1,1}|_w>1$. We now let $\mathcal{M}_0=\mathcal{M}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_1$ be an infinite subset of $\mathcal{M}_0$ satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 3.4. Hence for every $(n,q_{i,j})_{i,j}\in\mathcal{M}_1$, we can write $p=\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{d_i}\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n$ where the $\eta_{i,j}$'s satisfy the properties given in Proposition 3.4 (hence $\eta_{i,j}\neq0$ for every $(i,j)$). We have:

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}}\sum_{j=1}^{d_i}\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n\right|_w=|p|_w\le1. \tag{21}$$

From $H(1/\eta_{1,1}) = H(\eta_{1,1}) = e^{o(n)}$, we have that for every $\delta \in (0,1)$, $|\eta_{1,1}|_w > \delta^n$ when $n$ is sufficiently large. In particular, for every $1 < \Omega < |\alpha_{1,1}|_w$, we have:

$$\max\{|\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n|_w : 1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}, 1 \leq j \leq d_i\} \geq |\eta_{1,1}\alpha_{1,1}^n|_w \geq \Omega^n. \tag{22}$$

when $n$ is sufficiently large. Since $H(\eta_{i,j}) = e^{o(n)}$, from inequalities (21), and (22), we can apply Proposition 2.3 (with an appropriate $\epsilon$) to conclude that the $\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n$'s satisfy a non-trivial linear relation for infinitely many $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_1$. Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 3.2 yield a contradiction.

4.3. **Proof of Property (iii) of Theorem 1.4.** From $H(q_{i,j}) = e^{o(n)}$, we have that for sufficiently large $n$, for $1 \leq i_1, i_2 \leq \mathfrak{s}$, $1 \leq j_1 \leq m_{i_1}$, and $1 \leq j_2 \leq m_{j_2}$ if $\sigma(q_{i_1,j_1}\alpha_{i_1,j_1}^n) = q_{i_2,j_2}\alpha_{i_2,j_2}^n$ then $\sigma(\alpha_{i_1,j_1})/\alpha_{i_2,j_2} \in \boldsymbol{\mu}$. For the converse statement, it suffices to prove the following claim: fix $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q})$, $(i_1, j_1)$, and $(i_2, j_2)$, then for all but finitely many $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}$, if $\sigma(\alpha_{i_1,j_1})/\alpha_{i_2,j_2} \in \boldsymbol{\mu}$ then $\sigma(q_{i_1,j_1}\alpha_{i_1,j_1}^n) = q_{i_2,j_2}\alpha_{i_2,j_2}^n$.

We prove this claim by contradiction: assume there is an infinite subset $\mathcal{M}_0$ violating the conclusion of the claim. By Lemma 3.2, we necessarily have that $\sigma(\alpha_{i_1,j_1}) = \alpha_{i_2,j_2}$ and indeed $i_1 = i_2 := i^*$ (otherwise, there is no such $\sigma$ and the claim is vacuously true). Hence $\sigma_{i^*}(j_1) = j_2$. As before, let $\mathcal{M}_1$ be an infinite subset of $\mathcal{M}_0$ as in Proposition 3.4, then $p = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{j=1}^{d_i} \eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n$. By Proposition 3.4, we have:

$$\sigma(q_{i^*,j_1}\alpha_{i^*,j_1}^n) = \sigma(\eta_{i^*,j_1})\alpha_{i^*,j_2}^n = \eta_{i^*,j_2}\alpha_{i^*,j_2}^n = q_{i^*,j_2}\alpha_{i^*,j_2}^n,$$

contradicting the fact that $\mathcal{M}_0$ does not satisfy the claim.

4.4. **Proof of Property (iv) of Theorem 1.4.** We need to prove that $|\alpha_{i,j}| < 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $m_i < j \leq d_i$. *In fact, we will prove the stronger inequality that* $|\alpha_{i,j}| \leq \theta$ *for* $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ *and* $m_i < j \leq d_i$.

Assume $|\alpha_{i^*,j^*}| > \theta$ for some $1 \leq i^* \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $m_{i^*} < j \leq d_{i^*}$. Let $\mathcal{M}_0 = \mathcal{M}$ and let $\mathcal{M}_1$ be an infinite subset of $\mathcal{M}_0$ satisfying Proposition 3.4. As before, for every $(n, q_{i,j})_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}_1$, we have:

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{j=m_i+1}^{d_i} \eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n\right| = \left|\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} q_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n - p\right| < \theta^n. \tag{23}$$

Write $N = \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} (d_i - m_i)$. Let $\mathbf{x}$ be the vector whose last coordinate is 1 and other coordinates are the $\alpha_{i,j}^n$. Then there is a constant $C_5$ depending only on the $\alpha_{i,j}$'s such that $H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \leq C_5^n$. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small such that $\theta < |\alpha_{i^*,j^*}| C_5^{-\epsilon}$. Since $H(1/\eta_{i^*,j^*}) = e^{o(n)}$, for every $\delta \in (0,1)$, we have $|\eta_{i^*,j^*}| > \delta^n$ when $n$ is sufficiently large. Together with the property $H(\eta_{i,j}) = e^{o(n)}$, we have:

$$\theta^n < \max\{|\eta_{i,j}\alpha_{i,j}^n| : 1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}, m_i < j \leq d_i\} \left(\prod_{i,j} H(\eta_{i,j})\right)^{-N-1-\epsilon} H(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})^{-\epsilon}.$$

Together with inequality (23), Proposition 2.3, Proposition 2.2, and Lemma 3.2, we obtain a contradiction.

## 5. Proof of Corollary 1.6 and Corollary 1.7

5.1. **Proof of Corollary 1.6.** Parts (i) and (ii) follow immediately from Theorem 1.4. In fact, for part (ii), we actually have that $|\sigma(\alpha_i)| \leq \theta$ thanks to the arguments in Subsection 4.4.

For part (iii), by using Theorem 1.4, we have that $\sigma(R_i(n)\alpha_i^n) = R_j(n)\alpha_j^n$ for all but finitely many $n \in \mathcal{M}_\theta$. This immediately implies part (iii).

5.2. **Proof of Corollary 1.7.** As explained before, we may assume that the linear recurrence sequence $a_n = Q_1(n)\alpha_1^n + \ldots + Q_k(n)\alpha_k^n$ is non-degenerate and $|\alpha_i| \geq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq r \leq m-1$, by restricting to $n \equiv r$ modulo $m$, we may replace $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ by $(\alpha_1^m, \ldots, \alpha_k^m)$. Hence we may assume that $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k)$ satisfies Properties (P1) and (P2) in Subsection 3.1. Let $\mathfrak{s}$ and $m_1, \ldots, m_{\mathfrak{s}}$ be as before. We also relabel the $\alpha_i$'s and $Q_i$'s as $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $Q_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$ as in Subsection 3.1. Corollary 1.6 gives that for every $\sigma \in G_{\mathbb{Q}}$, $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$, and $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq m_i$, if $\sigma(\alpha_{i,j_1}) = \alpha_{i,j_2}$ then $\sigma(Q_{i,j_1}) = Q_{i,j_2}$. In particular, we have $Q_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_{i,j})[x]$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $1 \leq j \leq m_i$. Let $d_1, \ldots, d_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and $\alpha_{i,j}$ for $m_i < j \leq d_i$ be as in Subsection 3.1. We can now define the polynomials $Q_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}$ and $m_i < j \leq d_i$ as follows: pick any $\sigma \in G_{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $\sigma(\alpha_{i,1}) = \alpha_{i,j}$, then define $Q_{i,j} = \sigma(Q_{i,1})$. Therefore the linear recurrence sequence:

$$b_n := \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{j=1}^{d_i} Q_{i,j}(n)\alpha_{i,j}^n = a_n + \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{s}} \sum_{j=m_i+1}^{d_i} Q_{i,j}(n)\alpha_{i,j}^n$$

is invariant under $G_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Let $D \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the coefficients of $DQ_{i,j}$ are algebraic integers for all $i, j$. Since the $\alpha_{i,j}$'s are algebraic integers by Corollary 1.6, we have $Db_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\theta_0 = \max\{|\alpha_{i,j}| : 1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{s}, m_i < j \leq d_i\}$. We have that $\theta_0 < 1$ by Corollary 1.6 (in fact, we even have $\theta_0 \leq \theta$ by the proof of Corollary 1.6). Let $\tilde{\theta} \in (\theta_0, 1)$. When $n$ is sufficiently large, the inequality $\|a_n\|_{\mathbb{Z}} < \tilde{\theta}^n$ is equivalent to the condition that $b_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ which is, in turn, equivalent to $Db_n \equiv 0$ modulo $D$. The set of such $n$'s is the union of a finite set and finitely many arithmetic progressions.

## References


[BG06] E. Bombieri and W. Gubler, *Heights in Diophantine geometry*, New Mathematical Monographs, vol. 4, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[CZ04] P. Corvaja and U. Zannier, *On the rational approximations to the powers of an algebraic number: Solution of two problems of Mahler and Mendès France*, Acta Math. **193** (2004), 175–191.

[ES02] J.-H. Evertse and H. P. Schlickewei, *A quantitative version of the Absolute Subspace Theorem*, J. Reine Angew Math. **548** (2002), 21–127.

[Mah57] K. Mahler, *On the fractional parts of the powers of a rational number (II)*, Mathematika **4** (1957), 122–124.

[Sch72] W. M. Schmidt, *Norm form equations*, Ann. of Math. (2) **96** (1972), 526–551.

Avinash Kulkarni, Department of Mathematics, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6, Canada
*E-mail address*: akulkarn@sfu.ca

Niki Myrto Mavraki, Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2, Canada
*E-mail address*: myrtomav@math.ubc.ca
*URL*: www.math.ubc.ca/~myrtomav

Khoa D. Nguyen, Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, And Pacific Institute for The Mathematical Sciences, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2, Canada
*E-mail address*: dknguyen@math.ubc.ca
*URL*: www.math.ubc.ca/~dknguyen